

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/084,608	02/26/2002		Norio Koma	349	4219	
26021	7590	04/05/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 500 S. GRAND AVENUE SUITE 1900				WANG, G	EORGE Y	
				ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGE	LES, CA	90071-2611		2871		

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Ameliandia - Ala	A 11 1/2					
		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	Office Action Summary	10/084,608	KOMA, NORIO					
	Onice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	The MAN INO DATE of the	George Y. Wang	2871					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.11 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 Ja	nuary 2005.						
·	• • •	action is non-final.						
3)	,—							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 4) Claim(s) 14-16 and 20-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 14-16 is/are rejected. 							
Application	on Papers							
10)🖾 ¯	The specification is objected to by the Examine of the drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2002 is/are applicant may not request that any objection to the correction of the corre	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/162,984. 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachment	(2)							
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) ·					
2)	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te					

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 6, 2005 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Newly submitted claims 20-25 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- (1) the specifics of a vertically aligned LCD comprising a plurality of orientation controllers comprising a first embodiment corresponding to claims 14-16;
- (2) the specifics of a vertically aligned LCD comprising a plurality of orientation controllers that are associated with a corresponding pixel electrode to extend linearly comprising a second embodiment corresponding to claims 20-22;

Application/Control Number: 10/084,608 Page 3

Art Unit: 2871

(3) the specifics of a vertically aligned LCD comprising a plurality of orientation controllers where two or more electrode regions are disposed along one or more slits or projections comprising a third embodiment corresponding to claims 23-25.

3. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 20-25 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Applicant is advised currently claims 14-16 are generic. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/084,608 Page 4

Art Unit: 2871

5. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koma (U.S. Patent No. 5,608,556) in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,880,797, from hereinafter "Yamada").

6. As to claim 14, Koma discloses a vertically aligned liquid crystal display (fig. 4) comprising a vertically aligned liquid crystal layer (fig. 4, ref. 41) disposed between a plurality of pixel electrodes (fig. 4, ref 31) and a common electrode (fig. 4, ref. 32), where the orientation of the liquid crystal is controlled by an electric field (fig. 5, ref. 42), and where the common electrode comprises a plurality of orientation controllers (fig. 4, ref. 33a) formed in areas corresponding to each of the plurality of pixel electrodes.

However, the reference fails to specifically disclose each of a plurality of the pixel electrodes divided by one or more slits or projections into two or more electrode regions, which are electrically connected and arranged in parallel with each other, and each of the orientation controllers associated with a corresponding pixel electrode and having portions extending along the direction in which one or more slits or projections extend where one of the orientation controllers is disposed between the two slits.

Yamada discloses each of a plurality of the pixel electrodes (fig. 3, ref. 201) divided by one or more slits or projections (fig. 3, ref. 20) into two or more electrode regions, which are electrically connected and arranged in parallel with each other, and each of the orientation controllers associated with a corresponding pixel electrode and having portions extending along the direction in which one or more slits or projections

Art Unit: 2871

extend where one of the orientation controllers (col. 7, ref. 42-53) is disposed between the two slits.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have each of a plurality of the pixel electrodes divided by one or more slits or projections into two or more electrode regions, which are electrically connected and arranged in parallel with each other, and each of the orientation controllers associated with a corresponding pixel electrode and having portions extending along the direction in which one or more slits or projections extend where one of the orientation controllers is disposed between the two slits since one would be motivated to better control the axial-symmetric orientation axis (col. 4, lines 31-39) for improved excellent display characteristic with no display roughness (col. 7, lines 47-53). Furthermore, a display with enhanced viewing angle characteristic and transmittance is provided with a reduced number of production steps (col. 4, lines 59-67).

7. Regarding claims 15-16, Koma discloses the vertically aligned LCD as recited above, however, the reference fails to specifically disclose orientation controllers with sloped projections extending along the longer edge of the electrode region and branching at both longitudinal ends of a corresponding one of the electrode regions toward the corner section of the electrode.

Yamada discloses orientation controllers with sloped projections extending along the longer edge of the electrode region and branching at both longitudinal ends of a corresponding one of the electrode regions toward the corner section of the electrode.

Art Unit: 2871

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have orientation controllers with sloped projections extending along the longer edge of the electrode region (fig. 4a) and branching at both longitudinal ends of a corresponding one of the electrode regions toward the corner section of the electrode (fig. 4b) since one would be motivated to better control the axial-symmetric orientation axis (col. 4, lines 31-39) for improved excellent display characteristic with no display roughness (col. 7, lines 47-53). Furthermore, a display with enhanced viewing angle characteristic and transmittance is provided with a reduced number of production steps (col. 4, lines 59-67).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed January 6, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's main argument is the Yamada reference does not disclose a pixel electrode having a "slit." Applicant asserts that fig. 3, ref. 20 of Yamada is "concave portion" and not a slit. However, Examiner disagrees. First, nowhere in the claim language or the specification is the term "slit" defined as a cut in the electrode as Applicant presumes. While Applicant supplies a definition from the Oxford English Dictionary that defines "slit" as a "cut" or "incision" or "aperture," Examiner notes that none of these definitions distinguishes the concave portion taught in Yamada. In fact, the concave portion of Yamada clearly has "an absence of an electrode" where the concave portion exists.

Application/Control Number: 10/084,608

Art Unit: 2871

Page 7

Applicant further argues that Yamada "does not disclose an electrode opposing a pixel electrode, and therefore includes no description or suggestion that an orientation controller is provided on a common electrode opposing the pixel electrode." However, Examiner asserts that the Yamada reference need not teach this element since the Koma reference sufficiently discloses a vertically aligned liquid crystal layer (fig. 4, ref. 41) disposed between a plurality of pixel electrodes (fig. 4, ref 31) and a common electrode (fig. 4, ref. 32), where the orientation of the liquid crystal is controlled by an electric field (fig. 5, ref. 42), the common electrode comprises a plurality of orientation controllers (fig. 4, ref. 33a) formed in areas corresponding to each of the plurality of pixel electrodes. The Yamada reference, therefore, is only used to modify for the "slit," as described above. And the reference provides more than adequate motivation to provide better control of the axial-symmetric orientation axis (col. 4, lines 31-39) for improved excellent display characteristic with no display roughness (col. 7, lines 47-53) and to provide an LCD with enhanced viewing angle characteristic and transmittance is provided with a reduced number of production steps (col. 4, lines 59-67).

As a result, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and Examiner maintains rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Y. Wang whose telephone number is 571-272-2304. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8 am - 4:30 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/084,608 Page 8

Art Unit: 2871

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gw March 31, 2005

> IARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY PRIMARY EXAMINER